

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

**AT BECKLEY**

QUASHAWN HAIRSTON,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:20-cv-00591

MICHAEL FRANCIS, Superintendent,  
Southern Regional Jail,

Respondent.

**ORDER**

Pending is Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus [Doc. 1], filed September 10, 2020. This action was previously referred to the Honorable Omar J. Aboulhosn, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission of proposed findings and a recommendation ("PF&R"). Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn filed his PF&R on December 23, 2020. Magistrate Judge Aboulhosn recommended that the Court dismiss the case pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b) and L. R. Civ. P. 41.1, as the petitioner did not pay the filing fee and made no effort to communicate with the Court regarding his failure to do so.

The Court need not review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (emphasis added) ("A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations *to which objection is made*."). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and the Petitioner's right to appeal the Court's order. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also United States v.*


*De Leon-Ramirez*, 925 F.3d 177, 181 (4th Cir. 2019) (parties may not typically “appeal a magistrate judge’s findings that were not objected to below, as § 636(b) doesn’t require de novo review absent objection.”); *Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989). Further, the Court need not conduct de novo review when a party “makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the Court to a specific error in the magistrate’s proposed findings and recommendations.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982). Objections in this case were due on January 11, 2020. No objections were filed.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the PF&R [**Doc. 7**], **DENIES** the Petition [**Doc. 1**], and **DISMISSES** the matter.

The Court directs the Clerk to transmit a copy of this Order to any counsel of record and any unrepresented party herein.

ENTER: January 19, 2021



  
Frank W. Volk  
United States District Judge